

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RESOURCE TRANSITION)
CONSULTANTS, LLC, a Washington limited)
liability company,)
)
Plaintiff, ¹)
vs.)
)
SOCORRO KEENAN, an individual,)
)
Defendant.)

Case No.: 2:15-cv-01537-GMN-NJK

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Motion to Remand (ECF No. 2) filed by Plaintiff Resource Transition Consultants, LLC (“RTC”). No response or opposition has been filed. For the reasons discussed below, the Motion to Remand is **GRANTED**.

Local Rule 7-2(d) provides that failure to file points and authorities in opposition to a motion constitutes a consent that the motion be granted. *Abbott v. United Venture Capitol, Inc.*, 718 F. Supp. 828, 831 (D. Nev. 1989). It has been said these local rules, no less than the federal rules or acts of Congress, have the force of law. *United States v. Hvass*, 355 U.S. 570, 574–575 (1958); *Weil v. Neary*, 278 U.S. 160, 169 (1929); *Marshall v. Gates*, 44 F.3d 722, 723 (9th Cir. 1995). Accordingly, the parties have consented to the Motion.

///

///

///

¹ Resource Transition Consultants, LLC (“RTC”) asserts that, although it is identified as a “defendant” on the Court’s docket, it believes this is a misnomer because it “is the court-appointed receiver in the underlying stated court case, and the petitioner under the Petition which commenced the Partition Action.” (Mot. Remand n.1). Accordingly, RTC is more appropriately identified as the “plaintiff” for purposes of this motion.

1 ///

2 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that that the Motion to Remand (ECF No. 2) is
3 **GRANTED** and this case is hereby remanded to the Eighth Judicial District Court. The Clerk
4 of the Court shall remand this case back to state court and thereafter close this Court's case.

5 **DATED** this 11th day of September, 2015.

6 
7 _____
8 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25